

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-31 are pending in this application. The Office has rejected claims 1-3, 6-8, 11, and 17-31 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nazem et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,227). Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazem in view of Sinden (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,826). Claims 9, 12, and 13 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazem in view of Garth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,701). The Office has objected to claims 14-16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but noted their allowability if rewritten in independent form. This Office action has been made final and is responsive to Applicant's communication filed on or before March 17, 2005.

Nazem 102(b) Rejection of Claims 1, 11, and 19

Nazem does not show or suggest "receiving data to be stored in a database system having plural data servers," as required by Applicant. In col. 2, lines 52-67 and col. 3, lines 1-21, Nazem teaches a custom page server used to service web page requests made by web browsers. (A page server is also referred to a web page server or a web server.) The function of the page server is to find or generate a web page requested by a web browser. Examples of page servers are Microsoft's Internet Information Server© (IIS) and Apache©. A page or web server is not a database server or database system. The function of a page server is to service HTTP commands from a web browser requesting a web page. A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the function of a page server is entirely different from the function of a database server and that it would be clearly improper to equate the two.

The Office asserts that Nazem depicts a "database system" in fig. 2 as "shared memory 212," having "plural data servers," depicted as "servers 230, 232, and 234." Applicant respectfully disagrees. In fig. 2, Nazem clearly shows a dashed line 104 around the "shared memory" 212, the "Sports Server" 230, the "Stock Server" 232, and the "News Server" 234 and defines these elements as part of the "page server." As shown above a page server is not a database server and furthermore Nazem does not show or suggest that these elements are databases.

The Office further asserts that Applicant's requirement for "receiving data to be stored in a database system" is found in Fig. 1 where "data from data sources" is depicted being received by "page servers 104." Applicant respectfully disagrees. As shown above, a page server is not a database system. The data being received by Nazem is clearly being stored in the page servers and not in a database or a database system.

Applicant further requires "receiving information associated with at least one characteristic of the data." The Office asserts that "'at least one characteristic of the data' is read on the type of news pages being received, for example, 'news, news headlines, sports scores, weather, and the like.'" Applicant respectfully disagrees. The examples given by the Office show only data being received by a page server. Nowhere does Nazem show or suggest that additional information associated with at least one characteristic of the data is received. Simply knowing by virtue of its source that weather data is related to weather or sports score data is related to sports scores is not the same as receiving information associated with at least one characteristic of the data. Applicant requires that data be received and that information associated with at least one characteristic of the data also be received. This element is missing from Nazem.

It is clear that Nazem fails to show or suggest all the elements of Applicant's claimed invention and therefore all claims are allowable over this reference.

102(b) Rejection of Claims Depending from 1, 11, and 19

Claims also rejected under 102(b) and depending from claims 1, 11, and 19 are allowable for at least the same reasons presented above.

103(a) Rejection of Claims 4 and 5 Over Nazem in view of Sinden

As stated by the Office, Sinden teaches a method for encoding handwritten symbols. The term database does not even appear in Sinden. Sinden therefore does not overcome the deficiencies of Nazem described above, and the claims are allowable over the combination of these references.

103(a) Rejection of Claims 9, 12, and 13 Over Nazem in view of Garth

Garth teaches a technique that uses periodic check-pointing of data during the loading of large amounts of data into a database. The technique further teaches that, should the loading of data fail at some point, the data loading process can be restarted from the last checkpoint, thus reducing the time needed to load data should an error occur. While Garth does teach the use of databases, it does not overcome the deficiencies of Nazem as described above. These claims are therefore allowable over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's claims are allowable over the prior art made of record. Applicant asks the Office to reconsider this application and allow all claims. Please charge any fees that might be due, excluding the issue fee, to deposit account 14-0225.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date:

July 18, 2005



Harden E. Stevens, III

Reg. No. 55,649

NCR Corporation
1700 South Patterson Blvd.
Dayton, Ohio 45479

(803) 939-6505
(803) 939-5099 (fax)